USEPA			WOI	RK ASSI	IC	SNMENT	FOF	RM	_	
1. WORK A	ASSIGNM	MENT IN	FORMATION			36	18a			5-13743
Project Nam	e Libby A					WA No.://		RI -08BC Revisi	on No.:	:
Activity:RI/F	S	EPA Co	ontract No.:68-V	V5-0022						
Contractor: (CDM-FPC		Cor	ntractor Co	ntı	rol No.:		Date:	02/13/	2002
2. DESCR	IPTION	OF ACT	ION							
Attach SOW /schedule by task Designate WAM Add add		in LOE scope litional tasks for increased activity	Amendment to Final WP Approval Approve change in LOE, scope, or budget Approve additional task		oroval o Final al ange in LOE,	Technical Direction Memorandum Details on scope, budget, or schedule Minor shift within SOW (no change in \$/LOE) Change in WAM X Set or revise expenditure limit (EL)		Incremental Funding Fund approved WP WA Closeout Notification Notify contractor to initiate WA closeout task Revise EL after final invoice Other		
			- * Fees In	cluded				· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		
CompleteTerm For	ion Form V rm WA	WA	Appro	roved Work Plan Budget		Expenditure Limit (EL)		mit (EL)		
	Total Funding Received (\$)*		LOE (Term WA	WA only)		(\$)*		LOE (Term WA only)		(\$)*
Current		.00						0		\$0.00
This action	\$250,0	00.00					200			\$30,000.00
Total	\$250,0	00.00	0		\$0.00		200		\$30,000.00	
4. WA CO	MPLETIC	ON DATI	Current: 12	/31/2002	-			Revised:	'	
prepare a w	orkplan p work ass	er attach	ed statement of prior to final ac	fwork. T	w	o individual t	rips t	en. This WAF dir o Libby, MT are a		
Contractor S	Site Manag	ger/Date		E	EPA Work Assignment Manager/Date 2/13/02					
Contractor Regional Manager/Date				E	EPA Project Officer/Date And The Project Officer/Date					
Sinda John 2-20-02					EPA Contracting Officer/Date / 2/2409					
Approved	As Submi	itted O A	approved With C	hanges 🔾	N	ot Approved		700		

RECEIVED
FEB 1 4 2002
TMS-G Office

USEPA			WO	RK AS	SIC	ENMENT	FOF	RM			
1. WORK	ASSIGNI	MENT IN	FORMATION		•	***************************************		OFBC			
Project Nan	ne Libby 1	Asbestons	RI SAP			WA No.:///	2-RI	RI - Revisi	ion No.:		
Activity:RI/	FS	EPA C	ontract No.:68-V	V5-0022	Modification No.: (C.O. Use Only)						
Contractor:	CDM-FP	C	Con	ntractor (Cont	rol No.:		Date:	02/13/2002		
2. DESC	RIPTION	OF ACT	ION								
Attach SOW /schedule by task Designate WAM		in LOE scope ditional tasks for increased activity	Final WP Approval Amendment to Final WP Approval Approve change in LOE, scope, or budget Approve additional task		oroval o Final al ange in LOE,	Technical Direction Memorandum Details on scope, budget, or schedule Minor shift within SOW (no change in \$/LOE) Change in WAM X Set or revise expenditure limit (EL)		Incremental Fundin Fund approved WP WA Closeout Notifi Notify contractor to in WA closeout task Revise EL after final Other	ication nitiate		
			- * Fees Inc	cluded							
○ Complete Term Fo	tion Form Torm T	WA	Appro	oved Work Plan Budget			Expenditure Limi				
	[funding eived)*	LOE (Term WA	only)		(\$)*		LOE (Term WA only)	(\$)*		
Current		.00						0	\$0.00		
This action	\$250,0	00.00			**********			200	\$30,000.0	00	
Total	\$250,	00.00	0			\$0.00	200		\$30,000.0	00	
4. WA CO	MPLETI	ON DATI	E Current: 12	/31/2002)			Revised:			
prepare a w	vorkplan p work ass	er attach	ed statement of prior to final ac	work.	Two	individual t	rips to	en. This WAF dire to Libby, MT are a		t in	
Contractor	Site Manag	ger/Date			EPA	Work Assign	nment	Manager/Date	Q 2/13	3/02	
Contractor Regional Manager/Date				EPA Project Officer/Date July Pour Coly							
,					EPA Contracting Officer/Date				•		
\ \vec{v}roved	l As Subm	itted \bigcirc A	approved With C	hanges () No	ot Approved					



enterprise?

UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

Page 1 of 2

REGION VIII

EPA		999 18TH STRE DENVER, COLORAD		<i>(</i>
	TECHNIC	CAL SERVICE PRO	OVIDER SELECTION	
FROM:	Jim Christiansen, W.	AM		
THROUGH:	Jodi Powell, CO	- 		
TO:	Bert Garcia			
Work mechanism ch	nosen			
CONTRACTS:				
			Current LOE as	
ľ			<u>Approved</u>	<u>Invoiced</u>
	act (R8 RAC; Base per			
1	ct (R8 RAC; Base perio	od ends)		
Out of Region R				
☐ ERRS contract	UOS Start	Gannett-Fle	_	
	contract	ROC contra	ect	
☐ ESS contract	 Other contract v 	ehicle (name)		
1) Descriptio	n of Objectives:Prepare	e RI SAP and beg	in transition from removal to	remedial work at Libby
2) What alter	native work mechanisr	ns were consider	ed? IAG, other RAC, GSA	
Removal IAG and ha	s extensive project exp	perience. Using C	urrently a prime contractor t CDM Fed allowed me to tap IAG overhead. Also a local	that experience while
4) What is th	e Independent Governr	ment Cost Estima	te value? \$195,000	
_	ress the following issu atutory authority is the		nsfer of funds?	
☐ Economy Act	·	tion authorities	International authoriti(Contact IAG coordin	
	selected, answer the	•		
best interest of the g	overnment to use this	IAG, 2) how will	vith its own forces, explain; the use of the IAG further e tly and as cheaply through o	economy and

Nomination and Appointment of the Contracting Officer's Representative (COR)

	ontracting officer partep	resemiative (CO11)					
and the second	United	States	Page 1 of 1				
EPA EPA	Environmental P	rotection Agency					
EFA		n, DC 20460					
ALORAINIA TION	<u></u>		CENTATIVE (COD)				
	N AND APPOINTMENT OF CON-	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	SENTATIVE (COR)				
1a. Name of Nominee:JAMES CHRIS	STIANSEN	b.Title:RPM					
		Series: Grade:					
c. Mailing address (include mail code		d.Telephone:					
Address:999 18TH STREET, SUITE		a. reiephone.					
City:	State:						
Mail Code:EPR-SR	ZIP:						
2. The nomination is for:	3. Training Completed:		-				
O Project Officer			Date Completed				
			<u> Date Completed</u>				
O Deputy Project Officer	Acquisition Training for Project Office	rs(Formally The Basic Project Officer	s				
Regional Project Officer	Course) (All Project Officers must con	•					
Zone Project Officer							
O Delivery Order Project Officer	Delivery Order Project Officer Contract Administration Course (All CORs must complete) 9/21/00						
Work Assignment Manager	Recertification Course (All CORs must	complete every three years)	3/21/00				
	necermication course (All COAs must	complete every three years;					
Alternate							
Other							
(Alternate)							
(Other)			· ·				
	ntract management experience and nom	inee's technical expertise in the subj	ect matter of the contract.				
5. The nomination is for contract No:		3					
6. I understand the COR duties are no	ot redeligable. In the event that I am una	able to continue performing my COR	duties, I will contact the				
Contracting Office immediately.							
	,	i					
	2/13/	67.					
Signature of Nominee		Date					
orginating of Non-mos	• •						
7. I certify that:							
	nt duties will be incorporated in his/her						
	, Confidential Financial Disclosure Repo nt workload will stay within his/her abil		puty Ethics Official.				
	tract menagement functions unsatisfac		fficer immediately				
	1		meer miniediatory.				
19	A A	- 2/13/02					
Signature of the Nominating Official,		Date					
Name (Print or type)	Title (Print or type)	Telephone					
			•				

Date

EPA Form 1900-65A (Rev. 7-94) Electronic and Paper versions acceptable.

Signature of the Appointing Official (Contracting Officer)



Federal Acquisition Institute OnLine University

JAMES CHRISTIANSEN

Has successfully completed the FAI
COR Mentor
September 21, 2000
Continuous Learning Points: 24

Gayle Messick Gayle Messick Analyst



Debovah O'Neill Debovah O'Neill Decage

US Environmental Protecti	on Agency	1. Name of O		tor					Date of Re	quisition
Washington, DC 20		Jim Christianse	en					02	2/13/2002	
		3. Mail Code		4. Telephone N	lumbe	r	É	5. Date It	em Requir	ed
Keque:	st/Order	epr-sr		303 312 6748				03/03/200		
PR ID #		6. Signature o	of Orig	inetor	`/	ラ				
PROJCHN-57BPE3	l			HE	_					
PO ID #		7. Recommen	nded P	rockrement Metho	od					
	!		/e	Other than	n full and	nd open competition	п	☐ Sole	source small	purchase
8. Deliver To (Project Manager)	9. Address			<u></u>	1	IO. Mail Code	[•		
Jodi Powell	999 18th Street Suite 300	.00				8EPR	303	3 312 6715		
Custodial Area:	Denver, CO 8020									
12. Suggested Source (Name, Address CAMP, DRESSER & MCK	s, Zip Code, Phon	e/Contact)	comr	Amount of money mitted is:	autho	For Small Purc orized to exce or \$100, Wh	ed the	e amount	shown in	
1331 17th Street SUITE 1050			lo lo	crease Decrease		X Yes			□ No	
Denver, CO 80202 Phone: 3032951237 FAX: 30329518	395		X 0,	riginal Cancellation		[A] 169			LJ 190	
		-	15. A	pprovals	_!					
a. Branch/Office		Date		d. Property Manag	gemen	nt Office Desig	gnee			Date
1/Am		2/13/0								
b. Division/Office		Date		e. Other (Specify)						Date
				Riger 4.	doz					2/13/02
c. Funds listed in Block 26 and Block available and reserved. (Signature of C		Date	f	. Other <i>(Specify)</i>						Date
faver ()	plush	0/14/1	02		***************************************					
16. Date of Order	N. Dider number	1 1 .		18. Contract Nur 68-1	mber <i>i</i> W5-01		100	. Discoun	t Terms	
20. FOB Point	21. Deli	ivery to FOB P	oint b	yOn at before (Di	ate)	22. Person	Takin	ig Order#	Quote and	Phone No.
23. Contractor/Name, Address, ZIP Co	ide)			24 Type of Ord a Purchase	der	114	lelerer	nce your	efoup	
				Please furnish ti	he abi	ove on the let	me ep	ecified o	n both sid	se of this order
				end on the ettec	chea e	sheets, it any,	melur	vest gait	ery as ind	icated.
				Delivery p subject t	provisi to the	ions on the re- terms and cor	verse ndition	are delete ne of the	ed. The d	ai rebro yra v ila
				- 3		T ME				
				☐ Oral		□ Writ	ten		☐ Confi	mmg

	25. Schedule										
Item Number (a)	Supplies or Services (b)	Quantity Ordered (c)	Unit (d)	Estimated Unit Price (e)	Unit Price (f)	Amount (g)	Quantity Accepted (h)				
1	Services - LIBBY RIFS OUY	1	each	250,000		\$250,000.00					
					Total \$	\$250,000.00					

Line	Document Control Number (Max 6)	Budget/FYs (Max 4)	Appropriation Code (Max 6)	Budget Org/Code (Max 7)	Program Results Code (Max 9)	Object Class (Max 4)	Amount (Dollars & Cents)	Site/Project (Max 8)	Cost Org/Code (Max 7)	SFO (Max 2)
1	LPV061	02	T	BALOP	50102D	2505	250,000	02BC	C001	21
2						ENT	ERED INTO IFM	8		
3						ВУ	FEB 14 2002			
4	i					01_				
27. U	nited States of	America By (Signature)		28. Typed Nam	e and Title o	Contracting Officer		Phone	

EPA Form 1900-8 Previous editions are obsolete. (E~Forms 4.4a)

Control Number: PROJCHN-57BPE3

SESSION1.SES

ACTION: R SCREEN: REQL USERID: KTOI 02/14/02 10:24:49 AM

*** REQUISITION ACCOUNTING LINE INQUIRY TABLE ***

WEY IS TRANS CODE, REQ NO, LINE NO

TRANS CODE: RO REO NO: 028ALPV061

RPIO: 08

01- LINE NO: 001 BFY: 2002 APPR: T RPIO: BUDGET ORG: 8AL0P PE: 50102D LINE AMT: COST ORG: C001 SITE/PROJ: 08BCC004 CLOSED AMT: BOC: 2505 RPTG CATG: OBLG AMT: 250,000.00

0.00 OBLG AMT: 0.00

LAST CHG STATUS: DESCRIPTION: LIBBY RIFS SVCS JCHRISTIANSEN

02- LINE NO: BFY: APPR: RPIO:

> BUDGET ORG: PE: LINE AMT:

SITE/PROJ: COST ORG: CLOSED AMT: BOC: RPTG CATG: OBLG AMT:

LAST CHG STATUS: LINE NO: BFY: DESCRIPTION:

03- LINE NO: APPR: RPIO:

LINE AMT: PE: BUDGET ORG:

SITE/PROJ: RPTG CATG: COST ORG: CLOSED AMT: BOC: OBLG AMT:

LAST CHG STATUS: DESCRIPTION:

02-*L009 HEADER CHANGE

Libby Asbestos Site Operable Unit 4 08BCCO04

Development of SAP for a Contaminant Screening Study, Part I of the Remedial Investigation

Statement of Work 2/13/02

SITE HISTORY & CURRENT STATUS:

Vermiculite was discovered just outside Libby, Montana, in 1881 by gold miners. In the early 1920's initial mining operations were begun by Mr. Edward Alley on the vermiculite ore body located approximately 7 miles northeast of Libby. Full scale operations began later that decade under the name of the Universal Zonolite Insulation Company (Zonolite). This ore body also contained amphibole asbestos fibers of the tremolite-actinolite-richterite-winchite solid solution series (herein referred to as amphibole asbestos or "Libby amphibole," Bureau of Mines Monograph, 1928). Unlike, the commercially exploited chrysotile asbestos, the Libby amphibole material has never been used commercially on a wide scale, and for the mine's operating life it was considered a tramp contaminant. The commercially exploited vermiculite was used in a variety of products, including in insulation and construction materials, as a carrier for fertilizer and other agricultural chemicals, and as a soil conditioner.

Operations at the mine were fairly simple. The ore was strip mined using conventional equipment and then processed in an on-site dry mill to remove waste rock and overburden. Once beneficiated, the processed ore was trucked down Rainey Creek Road to the Screening Plant, which separated the milled ore into five size ranges for use in various products. From there, the material was shipped across the country, predominantly by rail, for either direct inclusion in products, or for expansion (also known as exfoliation) prior to use in products. Expansion (also known as "exfoliation" or "popping") was accomplished by heating the ore, usually in a dry kiln, to approximately 2000 °F, which boiled the water trapped in the crystalline matrix of the vermiculite. This expanded the material by a factor of 10 to 15 fold.

In Libby, operations handling this material occurred at four main locations: the Mine and Mill located on Rainey Creek Road on top of Zonolite Mountain; the Screening Plant and Railroad Loading Station located astride the Kootenai River at the intersection of Rainy Creek Road and Highway 37 (the Screening Plant); the Expansion/Export Plant (the Export Plant) located off Highway 37 where it crosses the Kootenai River; and at an Expansion Plant located at the end of Lincoln Road, near 5th Street (Figure 2). The Lincoln Road Expansion Plant apparently went off line sometime in the early 1950's, and has since been demolished. Investigations are

underway to determine the exact location of this facility.

In 1963, the W.R. Grace Company (Grace) purchased Zonolite and continued operations in a similar fashion. A wet milling process was added to the operation in 1975, which operated in tandem with the dry mill, until the dry mill was taken off line in 1985. Expansion operations at the Export Plant ceased in Libby sometime prior to 1981, although this area was still used to bag and export milled ore until mining operations were stopped in 1990. Before the mine closed in 1990, Libby produced about 80% of the world's supply of vermiculite.

Since 1998, EPA Region VIII's Emergency Response Branch (ERB) has been conducting sampling and cleanup activities to address highly contaminated areas in the Libby Valley. This investigation was initiated in response to media articles which detailed extensive asbestos related health problems in the Libby population. While at first the situation was thought limited to those with direct or indirect occupational exposures, it soon became clear that there were multiple exposure pathways and many persons with no link to mining related activities were affected. Details of the health effects are still being evaluated, but a good summary can be found in the recent Health Screening conducted by ATSDR.

Typically, the amphibole asbestos contamination found in the Libby Valley comes from one or some combination of several "primary" sources: a) Vermiculite mining wastes; b) Vermiculite ores; c) Vermiculite processing wastes; d) Bulk residuals from vermiculite processing; e) "Tremolite rocks;" and f) Zonolite Attic Insulation (ZAI). Asbestos from these primary sources also has found its way into settled interior dusts and local soils, which in turn can act as secondary sources. To date, the general goal of ERB has been to find and identify areas with clearly elevated levels of asbestos (the primary sources) and to remove it. ERB has conducted extensive investigations and cleanups at: (1) the export plant and adjacent properties, (2) the screening plant and adjacent properties, (3) several residential/commercial properties with asbestos source materials present, and (4) most local schools. Details of these operations can be found in the applicable Action Memorandums.

Future work is aimed at: (1) continuing to identify and remove areas with primary sources on a broader scale. In that regard, EPA is currently considering removing all ZAI from homes in the Libby Valley. (2) Shifting focus to secondary sources, where risks may be more of a chronic nature as opposed to acute. The proposal of the Libby Asbestos Site to the National Priorities List (NPL) will facilitate both of these goals. Pursuant to the NPL proposal, EPA is initiating a Remedial Investigation (RI) aimed at addressing both goals for the entire Libby Valley. This work assignment aims to develop a Sampling and Analysis Plan (SAP) for the first phase of that effort.

For long-term management purposes, the Libby Asbestos Site is divided into essentially two parts: Operable Unit 3 (OU3), which represents the former vermiculite mine and the access road, and Operable Unit 4 (OU4), which in general represents the remainder of the Libby Valley. This work assignment addresses only OU4.

RI APPROACH:

While the ERB investigation has targeted specific areas, a new screening and sampling approach is necessary that will systematically address the entire Libby Valley. Because of the ubiquitous nature of the asbestos in the Libby Valley and the random nature of its presence at specific properties, EPA envisions using a two step approach for RI data collection. First, a "Contaminant Screening Study" step, which is the subject of this work assignment. This step will be used to screen and classify all properties (or specific portions of properties) as either (A) highly contaminated and candidates for source removal (for example finding a garden with vermiculite materials or a home with ZAI), (B) clean and subject to no further investigation, and (C) contaminated at a level which will require further study to determine if cleanup is necessary. Second, a sampling step will focused on obtaining risk assessment level data for (C). The sampling step will be addressed at a later date, but should be considered as CDM Federal develops a strategy for this work assignment.

Due to the ongoing nature of ERB work, the complexity of the Libby Site, and the variety of EPA programs and associated contractors involved, significant coordination will be required in performance of this work assignment.

PERIOD OF PERFORMANCE:

Initiation through 12/31/02. Work assignment may be extended.

SPECIFIC TASKS:

CDM Federal shall furnish personnel, services, materials and equipment required to perform RI activities in accordance with all applicable regulations and guidance including but not limited to OSWER Directive 9355.3-01, 10-88 (Guidance for Conducting Remedial Investigations and Feasibility Studies under CERCLA). The following work breakdown structure shall be used for project scoping, scheduling, and technical and cost tracking and reporting.

TASK 1 PROJECT PLANNING AND SUPPORT

This task includes work efforts related to project initiation and support. Typical activities the contractor may be tasked to perform include but are not limited to:

- 1.1 Attend one scoping meeting at EPA in Denver.
- 1.2 Develop work plan and associated cost estimate.
- 1.3 Negotiate work plan and make necessary revisions as a result of EPA comments and/or negotiated agreements.
- 1.4 Provide conflict of interest disclosure.
- 1.5 Travel to Libby, Montana or Cambridge, MA for inspections, local coordination, and project planning. EPA envisions approximately 8 individual trips over the course of the work assignment.

31

- Perform various project coordination tasks as directed by the WAM. This may involve frequent and routine communication with the Volpe Center, EPA ERB, and other contractors to ensure all overlapping tasks are coordinated. It may also involve obtaining information, setting up meetings, and other routine tasks. See also Tasks 3, 4, 5. and 6.
- 1.7 Review background materials provided by the WAM. This will include ERB Phase I and II ERB Sampling and Analysis Plans and associated addendums, ERB Action Memorandums (3), and EPA Risk Memorandums. Directly coordinate and communicate with other involved agencies/contractors (e.g. EPA ERB, Volpe Center, USGS, Syracuse Research Corporation, labs) to obtain and review necessary data and background/technical information for preparing and implementing the SAP. Before preparation of the SAP, EPA will conduct a variety of meetings and calls related to scoping an approach to this effort. CDM Federal will participate in these meetings/calls as directed by the WAM, and provide input to EPA to be used in making a decision. Based on this, WAM will provide guidance on the general strategy for the screening. It is assumed throughout that CDM Federal will have ready access to the Libby Analytical Database currently being managed by CDM through, and in conjunction with, the Volpe Center.
- 1.8 Compile GIS base maps and coverages of all properties in the Libby Valley, obtain addresses and establish a coding system for public distribution, and provide accurate counts of properties by type: single family dwelling, single family dwelling large property (> ½ acre), multiple family dwelling, small commercial, large commercial, other. It is understood that much of this work is complete and progressing through other branches of CDM; that work should be built upon, not duplicated, and focused toward this effort. For each property, an accurate graphic presentation of the property, showing key sampling "zones" will be required.
- 1.9 Based upon background materials, scoping meetings, and guidance from WAM (Task 1.7), prepare a site specific Sampling and Analysis Plan for the Contaminant Screening Study, including a Field Sampling Plan and Quality Assurance Project Plan. Title the document "SAP, Remedial Investigation, Contaminant Screening Study, Libby Asbestos Site, OU4. The SAP should describe the screening process and number, type and location of samples, and type of analyses. A clear rationale for the approach should be presented. The general approach should be consistent with Phase I ERB SAP, especially QA/QC procedures. The SAP will be prepared in accordance with EPA QA/R-5 (latest draft/revision) and any other applicable guidance. The plan shall describe the data quality objectives and measures necessary to achieve adequate data for this effort. Adequacy of existing soil data should also be considered. Provide for one review cycle, with draft copies given to EPA (5), MTDEQ(2), Volpe (2), USGS (1), and Syracuse Research Corporation (1).
- 1.10 Perform site specific project management (monitor costs, prepare Monthly Progress Report and Invoice).
- 1.11 In conjunction with Task 1.6, prepare meeting minutes as requested by WAM. Meeting notes will generally consist of a typed summary (in a bulleted or numbered format). EPA assumes that a maximum of one hour will be required to prepare typed notes for any specific meeting and a maximum of 6 such meetings.
- 1.12 Submit costs to the Contracting Officer for approval for RI/FS work assignment specific

Pollution Liability Insurance, if the contractor plans to bill insurance premiums as a direct charge to the work assignment and there is no contract wide Pollution Liability Insurance. (NOTE: The Contractor shall track and report all costs associated with this sub-task separately and in accordance with the Reports of Work, Attachment B, of this contract.)

1.13 Respond to requests for information/documentation related to enforcement/legal proceedings associated with the Libby Site, only as pertains to this WA.

TASK 2 COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT

N/A at this time.

TASK 3 FIELD INVESTIGATION

This task includes work efforts to collect environmental samples and conduct physical screening in support of the Contaminant Screening Study. This task will be performed primarily by the Volpe Center and its contractors, in coordination with CDM Federal. CDM Federal's work related to this task will be limited to coordination with Volpe and it's contractors and onsite inspections (to ensure correct field implementation of the SAP). It is expected that data collection will be complete before fall 2002. A copy of the Volpe SOW for this work is attached. Capture LOE and costs for this task under Tasks 1.5 and 1.6, but provide a separate written work plan item specific to implementation of this task.

TASK 4 SAMPLE ANALYSIS

This task includes the laboratory or field analysis of environmental samples collected under Task 3. Again, this task will be performed primarily by the Volpe Center. CDM Federal's work related to this task will be limited to coordination with Volpe and it's contractors. CDM Federal will ensure that data deliverables are entered into the Libby Analytical Database and are presented in the appropriate format. Capture LOE and costs for this task under Tasks 1.5 and 1.6, but provide a separate written work plan item specific to implementation of this task.

TASK 5 ANALYTICAL SUPPORT AND DATA VALIDATION

The Volpe Center will schedule and coordinate analytical support. Following sample analysis, Volpe will be responsible for reporting of the data and population of the database in a manner consistent with the SAP. CDM Federal will coordinate to ensure Volpe is following QA/QA procedures established in the SAP. Capture LOE and costs for this task under Tasks 1.5 and 1.6, but provide a separate written work plan item specific to implementation of this task.

TASK 6 DATA EVALUATION

Again, while the Volpe Center is responsible for analysis of samples, reporting of data, and generic population of the Libby Analytical Database, CDM Federal is responsible for determining if the data collected in this effort meets QA/QC guidelines established in the SAP and is useable

for the purposes intended. CDM will coordinate with SRC (Risk Assessment Contractor) in making data usability determinations. In coordinating data entry with Volpe, CDM Federal may also have to request or perform changes in the database architecture, request or perform specific data entry, and design and make queries. Capture LOE and costs for this task under Tasks 1.5 and 1.6, but provide a separate written work plan item specific to implementation of this task. Overall, it is expected that CDM Federal, Volpe, and its contractor's will coordinate performance of Tasks 3-6 to ensure sound collection of samples, analysis of samples, data entry and validation, and data presentation.

TASK 7 ASSESSMENT OF RISK

N/A at this time.

TASK 8 TREATABILITY STUDY/PILOT TESTING

N/A at this time.

TASK 9 REMEDIAL INVESTIGATION REPORT

Due to the phased nature of the RI, a final RI Report is not envisioned for this WA. However, a final technical memorandum for the Contaminant Screening Study is required. This technical memorandum should include:

i

- o Site Background (very brief).
- o Investigation Description.
 - -Field Investigation and technical approach.
 - -Analytical methods and rationale.
- o Nature and Extent of Contamination on a per property basis (with sampling zones included)
 - -Visual
 - -Tabular
- o Nature and Extent of Contamination on a site-wide basis
 - -Visual
 - -Statistical
 - -Observed Trends
- o Summary and Conclusions.

Anticipate one review cycle similar to Task 1.9.

TASK 10 REMEDIAL ALTERNATIVES SCREENING

N/A at this time.

TASK 11 REMEDIAL ALTERNATIVES EVALUATION

N/A at this time.

TASK 12 FS REPORT AND RE/FS REPORT

N/A at this time.

TASK 13 POST RI/FS SUPPORT

N/A at this time.

TASK 14 NEGOTIATION SUPPORT

N/A at this time.

TASK 15 ADMINISTRATIVE RECORD

N/A at this time.

TASK 16 WORK ASSIGNMENT CLOSE OUT

This task includes efforts related to work assignment close out. Typical activities the contractor may be tasked to perform include but are not limited to:

- 16.1 Return of documents to EPA or other document repositories. File duplication, distribution, and storage. File archiving to meet Federal Records Center requirements. Use of microfiche, microfilm, or other EPA-approved data storage technology.
- 16.2 Prepare a Work Assignment Close-out Report (WACR) in accordance with Regional guidance or other procedures as specified in the work assignment.

NOTES:

- 1. It is anticipated that following completion of the specific tasks in this SOW that the RI WA will be modified and extended to encompass additional tasks.
- 2. The attached modified award fee plan will be used when evaluating perform

SCOPE of WORK

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA) to Department of Transportation Volpe Engineering Center (Volpe)

General Description: Volpe will collect and analyze environmental samples in accordance with a site specific Remedial Investigation (RI) Sampling and Analysis Plan (SAP) currently under development for the Libby Asbestos Site in Libby, Montana. This work will support both emergency response and RI activities at the Libby Asbestos Site.

Tasks:

- 1. Volpe will coordinate with CDM Federal Programs, the lead EPA contractor for development of the RI SAP, for development of the SAP.
- 2. Volpe will collect, or arrange for collection, of environmental samples as specified in the SAP. Contractors with experience in asbestos methods, and specifically contractors experienced at Libby, are preferred.
- 3. Volpe will analyze, or arrange for analysis, of those samples using methods specified in the SAP.
- 4. Data will be entered into the existing Libby analytical database. Electronic or paper copies of data or data summaries will be provided to CDM Federal and remedial project manager (RPM) as requested by the RPM.
- 5. Volpe will perform tasks related to the above as directed by the RPM.
- 6. Provide periodic status reports no less than quarterly or by reports as specified by the RPM.

Libby Asbestos Site RI/FS RI SAP; Contaminant Screening Study OU4

AWARD FEE DETERMINATION PLAN

February 2002

1. General

This document modifies the existing award fee evaluation procedure under the Response Action Contract (RAC.) Award fees payable under this contract range from zero-award fee to a maximum of six percent (6%) award fee and are based upon the existing RESPONSE ACTION CONTRACT PERFORMANCE EVALUATION BOARD RATING MATRIX FOR PIRS AND PERFORMANCE FEE (see attached.) The significant difference between the existing procedure and the modified procedure is a change in evaluation criteria and the weighting factors associated with each evaluation criteria. This document was based on the January plan used for the Bountiful/Woods Cross RI/FS work assignment; however, weighting factors used for evaluation were changed to incorporate what the WAM feels is most important for this specific work assignment.

2. The Existing Award Fee Evaluation Procedure

The <u>current</u> performance rating system consists of the following features:

- A four point rating system.
 - The highest performance rating available to the contractor is 4 points and the lowest performance rating possible is 1 point.
 - A performance rating of 4 points translates into the contractor receiving the entire available award fee.
 - The contractor must receive a score of 2.7 points to earn 60% of the available award fee. Scores below 2.7 do not qualify for award fees.
 - The contractor receives a larger award fee as the score approaches 4 points.
 - · Award fees are allocated at the end of the extrem. WORK ASSIGNMENT.
- The RPM rates the contractor's performance every six months and at the completion of the project.
 - The RPM rates the following seven categories: 1) Project Planning, 2) Technical Competence and Innovation, 3) Schedule and Cost Control, 4) Resource Utilization, 5) Reporting, 6) Effort, and 7) Small and Small Disadvantaged Business Utilization.
 - Each category receives a score of 1, 2, 3, or 4 points.
 One (1) point represents an "Unsatisfactory" rating,
 Two (2) points represents a "Satisfactory" rating,
 Three (3) points represents an "Exceeds Expectations" rating, and

Four (4) points represents an "Out Standing" rating.

- Each category (Project Planning, Technical Competence and Innovation, etc.) is weighted equally, i.e., each category is considered as important as the other six categories. Consequently, the overall contractor performance rating is based upon the average score from the seven categories. For example, if the seven categories receive the following scores: 2,3,4,3,4,2,3 the overall contractor performance rating would be as follows:(2+3+4+3+4+2+3) /7 => 21/7 => 3. As a result, the contractor would receive 69% of the available award pool based upon the RESPONSE ACTION CONTRACT PERFORMANCE EVALUATION BOARD RATING MATRIX FOR PIRS AND PERFORMANCE FEE.
- An existing performance/feedback matrix assists the RPM rate each of the seven categories. The matrix consists of general/generic statements intended to provide feedback to the contractor and assist the RPM score/rate each performance category.

3. The Modified Award Fee Evaluation Procedure

The <u>updated</u> performance rating system builds upon the existing system. There are four changes to the existing system.

- The seven Remedial Action Contract performance categories (Project Planning, Technical Competence & Innovation, etc.) were condensed into five RI/FS specific categories. The new categories are Documents, Communication, Field Work, Project Planning, and Management and Administration Tasks.
- A weighting factor was assigned to each performance category. For this work assignment <u>Documents</u> received a weighting factor of 30%, <u>Communication</u> a weighting factor of 25%, <u>Field Work</u> a weighting factor of 20%, <u>Project Planning</u> a weighting factor of 15%, and Management and Administration Tasks a weighting factor of 10%.
- Each rating category was further divided into subcategories and each subcategory was assigned a weighting factor. For example, <u>Documents</u> are divided into the following three subcategories: <u>On-Time Delivery</u> with a weighting factor of 30%, <u>Readability</u> with a weighting factor of 40%, and <u>Accuracy</u> with a weighting factor of 30%.
- A new performance/feedback matrix was developed. The matrix consists of quantitative rating criteria for each category/subcategory. More importantly, the matrix establishes project specific performance criteria, provides meaningful RI/FS specific feedback, and provides the RPM with a tool to qualitatively evaluate contractor performance.

4. The New Performance/Feedback Matrix

DOCUMENTS	Unsatisfactory {One (1) Point}	Satisfactory {Two (2) Points}	Exceeds Expectations {Three (3) Points}	Out Standing {Four (4) Points}
On-Time Delivery	Late without cause; schedule slipped resulting in project delays.	On-time delivery or late with prior approval of WAM or PO.	1 to 5 business days early or original schedule met in spite of impediments.	6 or more business days early.
Readability	The material required interpretation or required the reader to reread the material for understanding. The material was poorly presented or formatted and detracted from the message/information being presented	The document was written with the Plain Language initiative in mind. The material was presented logically and as prescribed in policy and guidance documents. There were 4 or fewer instances where "readability" editing was required by EPA. (Documents with fewer than 50 pages or greater than 100 pages will be evaluated proportionally) The document contained clear and concise tables, charts, figures, etc. There was good use of white space throughout the document.	The material was written clearly and concisely. There were 4 or fewer instances where "readability" editing was required by EPA personnel on highly complex documents, e.g., innovative technologies, intricate chemical processes, etc. Or, 2 or fewer instance where readability" editing was required by EPA personnel on routine project documents, e.g., HASPs, straight forward soil or groundwater investigation plans, etc. (Documents with fewer than 50 pages or greater than 100 pages will be evaluated proportionally). Narrative sections, as well as tables, figures, charts, etc., broke up the material into logical and manageable pieces. Stakeholders provided positive feedback on the readability of the document.	The document was written clearly and concisely. One or two "readability" editing was required by EPA personnel on highly complex documents, e.g., innovative technologies, intricate chemical processes, etc. Or, 1 or no :readability" editing was required by EPA personnel on routine project documents, e.g., HASPs, straight forward soil or groundwater investigation plans, etc. (Documents with fewer than 50 pages or greater than 100 pages will be evaluated proportionally). Material was written and presented in a fashion that provided the first time reader with a clear understanding of material. The majority of the stakeholders provided positive feedback on the readability of the document.

DOCUMENTS	Unsatisfactory {One (1) Point}	Satisfactory {Two (2) Points}	Exceeds Expectations {Three (3) Points}	Out Standing {Four (4) Points}
Accuracy	The document contained inaccurate or incomplete data or information. Recommendations or conclusions were inconclusive or not well founded. Based upon a draft document of 50 to 100 pages: EPA generated 15 or more substantive comments, or found 6 or more grammatical or typographical errors. Based upon a final version of a document consisting of 50 to 100 pages: EPA generated 5 or more substantive comments, or found 3 or more grammatical or typographical errors. (Documents with fewer than 50 pages or greater than 100 pages will be evaluated proportionally)	The document was accurate and complete and met the intended purpose as set out in the work plan. Recommendations and conclusions were based upon effective and thorough "data" analysis. The contractor provided EPA with interim deliverables (document outlines, sections, chapters,) for EPA comment prior to distributing the draft document to the stakeholder group. Additionally, these interim deliverables were of reasonable quality with respect to readability and accuracy. Based upon a draft document of 50 to 100 pages: EPA generated 14 or fewer substantive comments, and found 5 or fewer grammatical or typographical errors. Based upon a final version of a document consisting of 50 to 100 pages: EPA generated 4 or fewer substantive comments, and found 2 or fewer grammatical or typographical errors. (Documents with fewer than 50 pages or greater than 100 pages will be evaluated proportionally)	The document was accurate and complete and met the intended purpose as set out in the work plan. Recommendations and conclusions were based upon effective and thorough "data" analysis. Based upon a draft document of 50 to 100 pages: EPA generated 5 or fewer substantive comments, and found 3 or fewer grammatical or typographical errors. Based upon a final version of a document consisting of 50 to 100 pages: EPA generated 2 or fewer substantive comments, and found 1 or no grammatical or typographical errors. (Documents with fewer than 50 pages or greater than 100 pages will be evaluated proportionally)	The document was accurate and complete and met the intended purpose as set out in the work plan. Recommendations and conclusions were based upon effective and thorough "data" analysis. Based upon a draft document of 50 to 100 pages: EPA generated 2 or fewer substantive comments, and found 1 or no grammatical or typographical errors. Based upon a final version of a document consisting of 50 to 100 pages: EPA generated no substantive comments, and found no grammatical or typographical errors. (Documents with fewer than 50 pages or greater than 100 pages will be evaluated proportionally)

, i

COMMUNICATION	Unsatisfactory {One (1) Point}	Satisfactory {Two (2) Points}	Exceeds Expectations {Three (3) Points}	Out Standing {Four (4) Points}
	Tone (1) Tours	(100 (2) 101112)	(Tibee (5) Tollies)	(1001 (1) 101112)

•

.

Interaction with EPA, UDEQ, PRPs, and the Community	The contractor's communication with EPA was inconsistent or EPA was not updated about the status of the project. Work products (deliverables) did not reflect EPA's vision due to a lack of communication between the contractor and EPA. The contractor lacked the ability to identify and solve problems as they arose.	The contractor provided EPA with open and honest communication throughout the project. The contractor and EPA conversed, at a minimum, once every two weeks. On going communication with EPA during the development of deliverables created quality work products and eliminated wasted time and effort. EPA was always kept up to date on the status of the project. The contractor identified problems early in the process and developed viable solutions.	EPA was kept appraised of the contractor's progress weekly, if not more often, during high intensity periods of the project. Examples include the development of deliverables, field events, etc. The contractor was proactive. The project manager anticipated and addressed potential technical project issues before they became an impediment to the project. The contractor kept EPA appraised of discussions held with subject matter experts which affected the direction of the project. Problems were identified and addressed in a timely fashion. Timely problem resolution kept the project on schedule and on budget. Stakeholders provided EPA with positive feedback regarding the contractor's ability to keep them (the stakeholders) involved, informed and participating in meaningful ways.	The contractor was proactive. The contractor anticipated the needs and wants of EPA, UDEQ, the PRPs and the community. The contractor identified potential issues based upon its ability to "walk" in EPA's, UDEQ's, the PRP's and the community's shoes. Stakeholders provided EPA with positive feedback regarding the contractor's ability to keep them (the stakeholders) energized and working toward the common goal. Insightful problem identification and resolution accelerated the project schedule.
	{One (1) Point}	{Two (2) Points}	{Three (3) Points}	{Four (4) Points}

The contractor was The contractor's project Stakeholders commented Professional Presence Throughout the course of unprepared and lacked upon the contractor's manager and his/her the project the contractor the confidence and ability insightfulness, its energy support staff were built stakeholder respect, to address project knowledgeable, confident, trust and confidence. and level of engagement challenges. prepared and well spoken Based upon stakeholder in the project and provided positive when working with EPA, feedback the contractor feedback on the UDEQ, PRPs, and the was seen as a stake holder community. working towards a contractor's ability to mutually acceptable work with, and solution. communicate to, the The contractor demonstrated its stakeholder group. professionalism, The contractor responded dedication and When called upon the quickly and accurately to enthusiasm for the project questions and concerns contractor readily took on through its energy, raised by EPA, UDEQ, the role of technical technical ability, and its the PRPs and the expert, mediator, and time and resources community. The facilitator. management. contractor immediately handled The contractor responded the majority of the quickly and accurately to questions and concerns questions and concerns raised during meetings raised by EPA, UDEQ, and conference calls, i.e., the PRPs and the 4 out of 5 times. For community. The questions and concerns contractor immediately requiring research, the handled the bulk of the contractor adequately questions and concerns addressed the questions raised during meetings and concerns the first time and conference calls. 4 out of 5 times and within the agreed upon For questions and time limit. concerns requiring research, the contractor The contractor addressed the questions demonstrated active and concerns quickly listening skills and (within a week) and identified underlying accurately. concerns and fears. Furthermore, the

contractor identified and addressed stakeholder concerns and fears, the first time, 4 out of 5

times.

FIELDWORK	Field work was delayed without cause or the work was completed over budget. The field sampling plan or appropriate field document was not followed. Project goals and objectives were not met.	Field work was completed on time and on budget. Sample collection, well installation, etc. was conducted successfully and in a timely fashion as defined in the field sampling plan or other appropriate document. Project goals and objectives were fine tuned as additional information was maintained. Good communication was maintained between field personnel, contractor office personnel and EPA producing good field decisions. Limited down time was experienced waiting for decisions to be made, (less than 1 hour.) Field personnel were experienced, skilled and knowledgeable and required minimal training. A safe work environment was maintained throughout the field event.	Field work was completed on time, on budget, and within scope in spite of significant unforseen circumstances. Good communication was maintained between field personnel, contractor's office personnel and EPA producing good field decisions. Limited down time was experienced waiting for decisions to be made, (less than 15 minutes.) Problems were identified and addressed in a timely fashion. Timely problem resolution kept the field work on schedule and on budget.	The contractor worked through unanticipated logistical and technical constraints and turned potential failure into success. Insightful problem identification and resolution accelerated the project schedule.
DIDL DAVODIZ	Unsatisfactory	Satisfactory	Exceeds Expectations	Out Standing

FIELDWORK	Poor planning led to the duplication of effort and project delays. Procedures, methods, tools and equipment were inadequate for the planned event. Poor communication led to poor decision making in the field. Field sampling plans, Health and Safety Plans, Standard Operating Procedures, etc. were not available in the field for reference. Field personnel were not acquainted with the various field procedures and field documents.	The planning document was well thought out and anticipated potential problems. Data gaps were identified and addressed in the planning document. Contingency plans were in place and were ready to implement if necessary. Proper procedures and methods were developed ensuring success. Tools, equipment and experienced personnel were identified and available. Communication networks were in place ensuring success. Examples included: Lab contacts, EPA contacts, subcontractor contacts, land owner contacts, etc. Field sampling plans, Health and Safety Plans, Standard Operating Procedures, etc. were available in the field for reference. Field personnel were acquainted with the various field procedures and field documents.	The planning document was well thought out and presented in an easy to use/follow format for field and oversight personnel, e.g., tables, charts, figures, etc. Field procedures and methods were user friendly. Field personnel were familiar with the procedures and methods and found them efficient. Field personnel were well suited for the methods and procedures outlined in the planning documents. Additionally, the field personnel were experienced and skilled with the tools and equipment selected in the planning document.	Attention to detail in the planning document allowed field work to be conducted ahead of schedule, within scope, and below budget.
	Unsatisfactory	Satisfactory	Exceeds Expectations	Out Standing

Field personnel were unorganized or poorly suited for the tasks at hand. Tasks were poorly organized or poorly conceived and required rework. Field personnel utilized their time efficiently and effectively. Tasks and procedures were well organized and allowed field personnel the opportunity to quickly and efficiently accomplish work. Transitions between work activities were accomplished within a few minutes. Preparatory tasks such as checking testing equipment prior to use, having paper-work ready, ensuring site access, etc. were accomplished prior to the work being initiated. Field personnel utilized their time efficiently and deffectively in spite of unforseen events. Field personnel utilized their time efficiently and deffectively in spite of unforseen events. Field personnel autilized their time efficiently and deffectively in spite of unforseen events. Field personnel autilized the unforseen events. Field personnel autilized their time efficiently and deffectively in spite of unforseen events. Field personnel autilized efficiently and effectively in spite of unforseen events. Field personnel autilized efficiently and effectively in spite of unforseen events. Field personnel autilized thates and moved without delay from one activity to another. Field personnel worked "hard" (efficiently) and worked "hard"
1

•

÷.

r

PROJECT PLANNING	Unsatisfactory {One (1) Point}	Satisfactory {Two (2) Points}	Exceed Expectations {Three (3) Points}	Out Standing {Four (4) Points}
Schedule	Late without cause; schedule slips resulted in project delays.	Project schedule set relatively aggressively based upon EPA review times of 10 business days for draft documents and 15 business days for final documents. On-time delivery or late with prior approval of WAM or PO.	or Original schedule was met in spite of significant impediments.	3 or more weeks early.
Cost	The project was above budget for both cost and FTE without cause. Inaccurate tracking and reporting of costs. Spread sheet compilation errors (data entry or algorithm.) Cost control measures were not taken.	The project was within or below budget for both cost and FTE. Cost estimates were based upon standard and innovative investigative methods. Costs were tracked and reported accurately. Accounting items which carry over from previous reporting periods were clearly identified in the report. Accounting items billed in future reporting periods were clearly identified in the report. The contractor notified EPA when FTE and funding ceilings were approaching. Spread sheets, Work Plan(s), and monthly reports accurately reflected estimated costs, actual costs, and task items.	The project was within scope and 5 to 10 percent below budget. Or The project was within budget and scope despite significant project impediments. And Reported costs did not encompass rework (resampling, additional mobilizations, etc) due to contractor error or oversight.	The project was within scope and was greater than 10 percent below budget

PROJECT PLANNING	Unsatisfactory {One (1) Point}	Satisfactory {Two (2) Points}	Exceeds Expectations {Three (3) Points}	Out Standing {Four (4) Points}
Scoping	Work items were not clearly or adequately identified in the Work Plan. The original Work Plan and cost estimate required 2 or more revisions based upon a poor understanding of EPA's vision or based upon errors in the document or spread sheet.	EPA and the contractor had a similar understanding of the project's complexity, i.e., both EPA and the contractor felt that the project was straight forward or both felt the project was complex, or very complex for various agreed upon reasons. All work items were adequately identified. The contractor's Work Plan accurately reflected EPA's vision for the project (based upon 1 face-to-face scoping meeting, 2 or 3 conference calls, emails, etc.) and resulted in one revision to the original Work Plan and cost estimate. Minor changes to the scope of work were incorporated into the project quickly and efficiently.	All work items were clearly and adequately identified. The contractor's Work Plan accurately reflected EPA's vision for the project (based upon 1 face-to-face scoping meeting, 2 or 3 conference calls, emails, etc.) and resulted in one minor revision to the original Work Plan and cost estimate. While developing the Work Plan the contractor identified potential data gaps or missing elements, and with EPA approval, addressed them as part of the deliverable. Minor changes to the scope of work were addressed quickly, efficiently, and in a cost effective manor.	The contractor's Work Plan accurately reflected EPA's vision for the project (based upon 1 face-to-face scoping meeting, 2 or 3 conference calls, emails, etc.) and resulted in no revisions to the original Work Plan and cost estimate.

.

MANAGEMENT AND ADMIN TASKS	Unsatisfactory {One (1) Point}	Satisfactory {Two (2) Points}	Exceeds Expectations {Three (3) Points}	Out Standing {Four (4) Points}
and Cost Control	Personnel were not available to work on the project. High level professional pay grades were utilized when lower grade professionals were appropriate. Subcontractors and external team members increased the costs to the project either directly or indirectly, e.g., poor communication caused rework, overhead costs and billing rates exceeded the contractor's billing rates, etc.	Skilled and experienced personnel were always available to work on the project and produced an overall work product acceptable to the government. The contractor utilized the appropriate mix of professionals to accomplish project tasks and manage costs. The contractor effectively managed and monitored its subcontractors and external team members. The use of subcontractors and external team members increased the quality and timeliness of the work in a cost effective manor.	The contractor minimized costs and hours in the Work Plan by utilizing an aggressive mix of higher and lower level professional grade employees. Team members worked together in a efficient and effective manor. Work products were seamless, e.g. deliverables were written in a consistent tone and style, consistent information and messages were presented throughout meetings, etc.	The contractor's Project Manager minimized cost and time expenditures by utilizing efficient and knowledgeable staff and subcontractors creating an exceptional overall work product.
Project Support	Poor quality deliverables, e.g., photo copies, etc. Project delays or rework due to poor communication or interaction between the contractor and contractor's staff or between the contractor and its subcontractor or external team members.	Administrative tasks such as copying and compiling documents, word processing, equipment tracking, etc. were accomplished in a timely and professional fashion. Team members worked together in a fashion that added value to the project. For example, data base personnel created clear and concise tables; clerical staff ensured proper formatting, grammar and spelling; and document reviews produced clear, concise, and well written documents; etc.	Administrative tasks were handled quickly and professionally. Based upon EPA and stakeholder subject matter experts' feedback, the contractor and its subcontractor(s) risk assessors, chemists, hydrologists, etc. were seen as bringing their technical expertise to bear on the project and seen as effective communicators both verbally and in written form. Team members worked together in a fashion that added value to the project and reduced costs and rework.	Team members worked together in a fashion that added value to the project and eliminated the need for EPA personnel to edit, correct, or comment upon work products developed by the contractor.

Notes:

- 1. Activities outside of the contractor's control will not affect the contractor's performance evaluation.
- 2. The contractor may request a change or modification to the criteria language after the first six-month evaluation period.
- 3. Categories not evaluated during any given evaluation period will be given a not rated (NR).
- 4. EPA will solicit stakeholder feedback on document readability and professional presence.
- 5. Draft documents are defined as documents prepared by the contractor, reviewed by EPA in advance of the document's delivery due date, revised by the contractor, and submitted to the stakeholder group. It is the responsibility of the contractor to provide EPA with adequate time to review document outlines, sections, chapters, etc. prior to the document's delivery due date.
- 6. Individual documents will be rated/scored upon receipt. The overall document rating/score (reported every 6 months or at contract completion) will be based upon the average score of all the documents, within that time period, keeping in mind the complexity and importance of each document. For example, an Out Standing rating/score on the RI report will carry more weight than an unsatisfactory rating/score on a technical memo.

alter

5. EVALUATION/SCORING REPORT

STATE OF THE OWN OF THE OWN				
	(A) CATEGORY WEIGHTING	(B) SURCATEGORY WEIGHTING	(C) SCORE/RATING: 1= UNSATISPACTORY 2= SATISFACTORY 3= EXCEEDS EXPECTATIONS 4= OUT STANDING	(A*B*C) WEIGHTED RATING
DOCUMENTS	30%	34H Válb 34H		
On-Time Delivery	0:30	09:0	()	0.3 * 0.60*()=
Readability	0:30	0.20	()	0.3* 0.20 *()=
Accuracy	0:30	0.20	()	0.3* 0.20 *()=
COMMUNICATION	10%	60% 40%		
Interaction with EPA, UDEQ, etc.	0.50	09'0	()	0.5 * 0.60 * () =
Professional Presence	0.50	0.40	()	0.5 * 0.40 * ()=
TIELD WORK	NA	9606 305 385		
Goals and Objectives		0.35	()	0.0 * 0.35 *()=
Planning		0.35	()	0.0 * 0.35 * () =
Efficiency		06.0	()	0.0 * 0.30 * () =
PROJECT PLANNING	10%	\$630 Batt 886		
Schedule	0.10	0.30	()	0.1 * 0.30 * () =
Cost	0.10	0.30	()	0.1 * 0.30 * () =
Scoping	0.10	0.40	()	0.1 * 0.40 * ()==
Management & Admin	10%	9430 ° (19		
FTE & Cost Control	0.10	09.0	()	0.10* 0.60 * ()=
Project Support	0.10	0.40	()	0.1 * 0.40 * ()=
TOTAL WEIGHTED RATINGS (SUM OF WEIGHTED RATINGS)				Sum of this column =

EXAMPLE EVALUATION/SCORING REPORT

	(A) CATEGORY WEIGHTING	(B) SUB CATEGORY WEIGHTING	(C) SCORE/RATING: 1= UNSATISFACTORY 2= SATISFACTORY 3= EXCEEDS EXPECTATIONS 4= OUT STANDING	(A*B*C) WEIGHTED RATING
POCUMENTS	30%	30% 40% 30%		
On-Time Delivery	0.30	0:30	(2)	0.30 * 0.30 * (2) = 0.18
Readability	0.30	0.40	(3)	0.30 * 0.40 *(3)= 0.36
Accuracy	0.30	0.30	(2)	0.30 * 0.30 * (2)= 0.18
COMMUNICATION	25%	60% 40%		
Interaction with EPA, UDEQ, etc.	0.25	09:0	(4)	0.25 * 0.60 * (4) = 0.6
Professional Presence	0.25	0.40	(4)	0.25 * 0.40 * (4) = 0.4
FIELD WORK	70%	396, 35%, 39g		
Goals and Objectives	0.20	0.35	(2)	0.20 * 0.35 * (2) = 0.14
Planning	0.20	0.35	(4)	0.20 * 0.35 * (4) = 0.28
Efficiency	0.20	0.30	(3)	0.20 * 0.30 * (3)= 0.18
PROJECT PLANNING	7451	JUS 40x 40x		
Schedule	0.15	0.30	(3)	0.15 * 0.30 * (3) = 0.135
Cost	0.15	0.30	(3)	0.15 * 0.30 *(3) = 0.135
Scoping	0.15	0.40	(3)	0.15 * 0.40 * (3)= 0.18
Management & Admin	1372	351B . 4633		
FTE & Cost Control	0.10	09:0	(1)	0.10 * 0.60 * (1) = 0.06
Project Support	0.10	0.40	(1)	0.10 * 0.40 * (1)= 0.04
TOTAL WEIGHTED KATING (SUMFOF WEIGHTED RATINGS)				Sum of this column = 2.87

According to the RESPONSE ACTION CONTRACT PERFORMANCE EVALUATION BOARD RATING MATRIX FOR PIRS AND PERFORMANCE FEE a score/rating of 2.87 translates to a performance award fee of 63% of the available award pool.

7. WACR/WAPR

WORK ASSIGNMENT COMPLETION REPORT (WACR) WORK ASSIGNMENT PERFORMANCE REPORT (WAPR)

Contractor and WA No.:	RPM:	Site:
Evaluation Period:	Signature and Da	te:
WA Form Ten	m Completion	
Brief Description of Activity:		Overall Rating/Total Weighted Rating (Taken from the Evaluation/Scoring Report):
PERFORMANCE CRITERIA	SUPPORTING COMMENTS	
Documents On-Time Delivery Readability Accuracy Communication Interaction with EPA, UDEQ, etc. Professional Presence		
Field Work Goals and Objectives Planning Efficiency		

		 			
Project Planning Schedule					
Cost					
Scoping					
			•		
Management & Administration FTE & Cost Control					
Project Support					
Over all Strengths and	<u></u>	 		·	
Over all Strengths and Weaknesses					
					•
PO Assessment and Certification					
					:
ļ	ı				
		·			ı

8. EXAMPLE WACR/WAPR

WORK ASSIGNMENT COMPLETION REPORT (WACR) WORK ASSIGNMENT PERFORMANCE REPORT (WAPR)

Contractor and WA No.:XXXYYYZZZ	RPM: Leclerc	Site: B/WC
Evaluation Period:01/02 - 07/02	Signature a	nd Date: xxxxyyy 12/01
WA Formxxxx		tion
Brief Description of Activity: RL	FS @ B/WC	Overall Rating/Total Weighted Rating (Taken from the Evaluation/Scoring Report): 2.87
PERFORMANCE CRITERIA	SUPPORTING COMMENTS	
Documents On-Time Delivery Readability Accuracy	throughout the document. The draft RI document of 100 pages contained 12 E or typographical errors.	harts, figures, etc. There was good use of white space PA generated substantive comments, and 3 grammatical mments, and 2 grammatical or typographical errors.
Communication Interaction with EPA, UDEQ, etc. Professional Presence	Stakeholders provided EPA with positive feedback r stakeholders) energized and working toward the con When called upon the contractor readily took on the	umon goal.
Field Work Goals and Objectives Planning Efficiency	Field work was completed on time and on budget. Attention to detail in the planning document allowed scope, and below budget. No duplication of effort was required and rework was	I field work to be conducted ahead of schedule, within . s kept to a bare minimum.
Project Planning Schedule Cost Scoping	Original schedule was met in spite of significant im The project was within or below budget for both cost While developing the Work Plan the contractor ident EPA approval, addressed them as part of the delivera	and FTE. ified potential data gaps or missing elements, and with

Management & Administration	Personnel were not available to work on the project.
FTE & Cost Control	Poor quality deliverables, e.g., photo copies, etc.
Project Support	·
Over all Strengths and Weaknesses	
Weaknesses	
PO Assessment and	
Certification	
	·
:	
• 1	·

Work Assignment Name: L.bb; RI Work Assignment No.:

COST CATEGORY	RATE	TASK 1	TASK 9	TASK 16	Work Assignmer Total
P4 Hours	\$52.66		10,0	5.0	160
P3 Hours	\$37.00		50.0	0.0	322
P2 Hours	\$27,19		100.0	15.0	1,462
P1 Hours	\$21.44		0.0	10.0	135
T3 Hours	\$20.70		0.0	0.0	0
T2 Hours	\$16.72	200.0	0.0	0.0	200
T1 Hours	\$16.21	0.0	0.0	0.0	0
PLOE Hours		2,089.0	160.0	30.0	2,279
Raw Professional Labor Dollars		\$60,349	\$5,096	\$886	\$66,33
Clerical Hours		69.0	50.0	20.0	139
Raw Clerical Labor Dollars	\$15.11	\$1,043	\$756	\$302	\$2,10
Total Rew Labor Dollars		\$61,391	\$5,851	\$1,188	\$68,43
Fringe Benefits	35.90%	\$22,039	\$2,101	\$426	\$24,50
Overhead	44.90%	\$37,460	\$3,570	\$725	\$41,7
Total Labor Costs		\$120,891	\$11,522	\$2,339	\$134,7
Travel (See Schedule A):			- 1		
Transportation		\$6,400	\$0	\$0	\$6,40
Lodging/Meals		\$3,600	\$0	\$0	\$3,60
Total Travel Costs		\$10,000	\$0	\$0	\$10,00
Escalation F	a 1	4.0,000	40	40	\$ 10,00
	s Escalated	Units	Units	Units	Units
Photocopying/per copy~ \$0.0628		2,100.0	1,500.0	150.0	3,750
Express Mail - Letter \$6.28		10.0	0.0	0.0	10
Express Mail - 2 Lb. Pkg \$6.50		10.0	0.0	0.0	10
Express Mail - 15 Lb. Pkg \$22.26		0.0	0.0	0.0	0
Express Mail - 40 Lb. Pkg \$45.01		0.0	0.0	0.0	
Express Mail - Priority 70 lb \$75.78		0.0	0.0	0.0	0
Express Mail - Priority 100 lb \$99.00		0.0	0.0	0.0	0
Equipment/Supplies Shipping \$50.00		0.0	0.0	0.0	0
Courier/trip \$18.00		0.0	0.0	0.0	0
Long Distance Telephone/10 min \$2.10	\$2.100	20.0	0.0	0.0	20
Cellular Telephone/10 min \$5.00	\$5.000	0.0	0.0	0.0	0
Supplies (See Schedule B)		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$
Utilities/Misc (See Separate Schedule)		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$
Total ODCs Cost		\$301	\$94	\$9	\$40
~No Escalation	·			1	
Computer:	Current Rate	Units	Units	Units	Units
Mainframe - E-mail (Non - CPU)/hour ~	\$18.73	10.0	10.0	0.0	20.
Mainframe - CPU Intensive Uses/hour ~	\$56.50	15.0	0.0	0.0	15.
Computer Workstation/hour ~ Total Computer Cost	\$6.00	0.0	0.0 \$187	0.0 \$0	0.
-No Escalation		\$1,035	\$107	30	\$1,22
Equipment (See Schedule E):	Í	1		.	
Purchased		so	\$0	\$0	\$
Rental		\$0	\$0	\$0	_ \$
Total Equipment Costs		\$0	\$0	\$0	Š
Total aquipment doold					
Pollution Liability Insurance Premium		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$
					_
Subcontract Pool (See Separate Schedules):	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$
eam Subcontractors (See Separate Schedule	is):				
DM Inc PLOE Hours		0.0	0.0	0.0	0.
CDM Inc Costs		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$
Other Team Sub PLOE Hours		0.0	0.0	0.0	0.
Other Team Sub Costs		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$
otal Team Sub PLOE Hours		0.0	0.0	0.0	0.
otal Team Sub Costs		\$0	\$0	\$0	<u> </u>
subtotal Cost		\$132,227	\$11,803	\$2,348	\$146,37
landling Charge on Team Subs & Subpool	4.70%	\$0	so	\$0	\$
6&A excluding Team Subs & Subpool	21.40%	\$28,297	\$2,526	\$502	\$31,32
ubtotal Cost & Handl Chg, G&A		\$160,524	\$14,329	\$2,850	\$177,70
		0.100,020			
		CE NER			\$6,60
Base Fee (Based on \$/LOE Hour)		\$6,058	\$464	\$87	
Base Fee (Based on \$/LOE Hour) ward Fee (Based on \$/LOE Hour)		\$9,359	\$717	\$134	\$10,21
ase Fee (Based on \$/LOE Hour)			\$717 \$15,510		\$10,21 \$194,52
ase Fee (Based on \$/LOE Hour) ward Fee (Based on \$/LOE Hour)		\$9,359	\$717	\$134	

IGCE Assumptions Sheet Work Assignment #						
TASK# ALL Work Assignment # Page of						
All of these will offect costs to some degree depending on ont come						
Summary for Task #						
LOE/HOURS P4= T3= Travel \$ Equipment \$ P3= T2= ODCs \$ PLI \$ P2= T1= Computer \$ Subpool \$ P1= Total LOE= C= C= C						

IGCE Assumptions Sheet					
1.1 One The hour meeting, Allow 3 P2; ZP3; ZP4 1 Cler					
1.2 Significant coordination required to develop work plan					
Ailow 80PZ 10P3 10P4 10 Cler					
1.3 Rontine regoliation à charger					
Allow 16PZ ZP4 S Cler					
1.4 Allow 1 P4					
1.5 Assure: 2 P4 Trips 3 days each = 50 P4					
6 PZ Trips 3 days each = 150 PZ					
Airfare = \$800 × 8 = \$6400					
$C_{ar} R_{e-1} = $200 \times 6 = 1200					
Per Die- = \$50 x 24days = \$1200 1totel = \$50 x 24days = \$1200					
1.6 For Task 1 coordination: 200 P2					
40 P3 40 P4					
For Task 3 coordinates: 30 PZ					
10 P3					
For Task 4 coordination: 30 PZ 10 P3					
For task & coordination: 50 PZ Work: 100 PZ 10 P3 50 P1					
For Task 6 coordination 50 PZ Work: 50 PZ 10 P3 Z5 PI					
CONT					
Summary for Task #					
LOE/HOURS P4= T3= Travel \$ Equipment \$ P3= T2= ODCs \$ PLI \$ P2= T1= Computer \$ Subpool \$ P1= Total LOE= C=					

```
IGCE Assumptions Sheet
                                          Page Z of Z
TASK#
                  Work Assignment #
       8PZ hows x 4 docs = 32 PZ
 1.7
       4PZ homs x 4 -tgs = 16 PZ
                       Misc = 20 PZ
                                  68 PZ
       Experts (QA, etc) = ZOP3
1.8 Assume extensive work done
                 Base Maps = 40PZ; 20P3
Prop Co-nt = 80PZ; 20P3
Data Su-n = 80PZ; 20P3
Prop Mag s ZUPZ
                  All: TZ ZOO Wis GIS Tech
1.9 SAP Allow 200 PZ; 100 P3; ZOP4; (00 Ckg
1.10 Rout -e PM 10 -onths × 10 PZ = 160 PZ
                                X 5 P1 = 80 P1
                                x 2 P4 = 20 P4
                                             50 Cler
1.11 6 PZ ; 3 Cler
                     Summary for Task #
                             Dollars (0,000
                                       Subpool
```

TASK # Travel - Sub	TOOL A								
	as Sheet Page / of /								
	tasks 1.5 & 1.6								
	a. i								
	"								
	-: -								
Summary for Task #									
P4= Travel	Ollars Equipment \$								

TASK# 9 Work Assignment # Page of.

Allow 100 PZ = report preprint -/
50 P3 = tech review experts
10 P4 = program service

50 Cler

Summary for Task #								
LOE/HOURS P4= 0 P3= 50 P2= 100 P1=	T3= T2= T1= Total LOE=	c= <u>50</u>	Dollars Travel \$ ODCs \$ 100 Computer \$ 7.66	Equipment \$ PLI \$ Subpool \$				

IGCE Assumptions Sheet Page of TASK # 16 Work Assignment # Allow 5 P4 Based on Richardson 15 PZ Flats 10 PI RI/FS 20 Cler Summary for Task #_ LOE/HOURS Dollars Travel Equipment \$ PLI \$ ODCs Subpool